DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 032 055 JC 690 316

By-Jones, Gordon

Community College Accessibility to the Economically Disadvantaged.

Pub Date 27 Mar 69
Note-82p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Economically Disadvantaged, *Financial Needs, *Junior Colleges, *Socioeconomic Status, *Student Characteristics
Identifiers-British Columbia

This study was made to determine the socioeconomic status of junior college students, to analyze certain characteristics of those in the poverty class, and to see which factors prevent so many of them from attending college. Representing both vocational and academic programs, a random sample of 315 Vancouver City College students answered a questionnaire, giving data on sex, age, choice of program, residence, earnings, family unit, occupational class, and source and knowledge of financial aid. The data were analyzed to determine the socioeconomic characteristics and the percentage of those in the poverty class. The study then examined the source and availability of financial aid and the difficulties of obtaining it. So many aid programs have built-in qualifications, restrictions, and limitations that the low-income student is automatically ineligible. The three most likely local sources of help for him are not widely enough known, and the applications for most other aid are unduly complex, discouraging to the student, incomprehensible to him or his family, and quite irrelevant to the situation. The reason such a small ratio of the poor attend college may well be that the restrictions and complexity of financial aid make it unavailable to those who need it most. [Not available in hard copy because of marginal reproducibility of original.] (HH)

ED032055

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACCESSIBILITY TO THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

by

Gordon Jones
Faculty
Vancouver City College

JC 690 316

March 27, 1969

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 28 1969

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

ABSTRACT

The central problem of this study is to determine the socio-economic characteristics of community college students; to analyze certain aspects of college students who are identified as economically disadvantaged (poverty class); and to suggest factors which might contribute to a lesser proportion of economically disadvantaged students attending the community college.

The method used was the analytical survey method.

A random sample, representative of career and academic sections of Vancouver City College was taken. Data obtained from a 315 member sample was analyzed to determine certain socio-economic characteristics of the sample and to determine the percentage of "poverty" defined students in the sample.

The second phase of this study was concentrated on the availability of existing financial aid to the economically disadvantaged student.

Social status of the sample was also studied using data for the total labour force by application of the Blishen scale.

Perhaps the most significant outcome of the study was the realization that the ratio of economically disadvantaged attending college was considerably smaller than the ratio of this economic group in the general populace. Results of the analysis of data, therefore, indicate that insufficient numbers of persons classified in the poverty category are taking advantage of tertiary education.

Further analysis of existing financial aid demonstrates that

this aid is restrictive in that, for the most part, it is unavailable for the students who for economic reasons require it most.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		ii
LIST OF TABLES		v
Chapter		
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Understanding of the Characteristics of Users of the Community College Review of the Literature Justification of the Study Poverty Defined Problem Hypothesis Plan of Study	
II.	PLAN AND PROCEDURE	27
	The Universe Data The Procedure	
III.	CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE	31
	Sex Age Career and Academic Students Place of Residence Earnings Family Unit Occupational Class Financial Assistance Source of Financial Aid Knowledge of Financial Assistance Source of Knowledge of Financial Aid	
IV.	TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS	52
	College Ratio of Economically Disadvantaged Low Obtainment of Financial Aid Restricted	
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	61
	Summary Conclusions Interpretations	
VI.	RECOMMENDATIONS	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY		72
APPENDIX		74

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Grouping of Vancouver City College classes for selection of sample and class breakdown, February 1969.....	28
2.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, by age group and according to course status.....	32
3.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to place of residence..	35
4.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to earnings reported for the year 1968.....	37
5.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to earnings reported of the family unit for the year 1968.....	40
6.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to occupational class, and poverty or non-poverty classification.....	41
7.	Number of 315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, reporting receipt of financial assistance.....	44
8.	Number of 315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, listed as economically disadvantaged (poverty).....	45
9.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to reported source of financial aid received.....	46

Table		Page
10.	Financial Assistance received according to source.	47
11.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to knowledge of financial assistance available to college students.....	49
12.	252 members of sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to source of knowledge regarding availability of financial assistance..	50
13.	Characteristics of financial aid available to Vancouver City College students.....	57
14.	315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to occupational class as compared with occupational class listed for Vancouver residents.....	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Understanding of the Characteristics of Users of the Community College

Understanding of the characteristics of users of community colleges will be a major factor in maintaining and developing such educational services. In the long run it will be the consumer, as it should be, who determines what college programs will be used, and to what extent. Because college education is voluntary, knowing the characteristics of its participants is a major concern. Since colleges are mainly concerned with students who may be generally classified as "adult", Schueler has commented that: "At no level of education is the adage 'Know your students' more crucial."[1] The problem then is to discover the fundamental characteristics of college students who may be widely differentiated in terms of varying socio-economic backgrounds.

Reports of various groups in Canada are showing a growing concern for the socio-economic class of persons at the "poverty" level, or as this writer prefers to identify them, the economically disadvantaged. And it is this economically disadvantaged class of persons that this report is primarily concerned. There may be many reasons why a family may find itself at this lowest point on the socio-economic scale, but

1 Schueler, Herbert, "The Method of Adult Education", Adult Leadership, April 1957, p. 308.

education (or perhaps lack of education is a better term) must be considered as one of the most important causative factors.

One reason for poverty's partial invisibility is that the poor tend to be collectively inarticulate. Many of them lack the education and the organization to make themselves heard. For example, most of them are outside the ambit of the trade union movement. They have few spokesmen and groups to represent them and give voice to their needs.

The provision of adequate education generally, plus deliberate special efforts to help those family circumstances which tend to discourage persistence in education, must form a highly important part of policy against poverty. The performance of the educational system in general and the community college movement in particular can have very long-range effects. To the extent that it fails to perform well in helping the students of low-income parents to break out of the poverty cycle, there are likely to be distressing social and economic costs for one and perhaps more generations.

Review of the Literature

Understanding the problems of the economically disadvantaged student who is usually also culturally deprived is a major factor in developing educational services which are readily accessible for him. In the long run society benefits if its human potential is developed to the fullest. Education for the economically disadvantaged means less burden to our welfare agencies by restricting the vicious circle of poverty in a family cycle.

Professor John Porter's study of social class and power in Canada titled The Vertical Mosaic[1] has banished many myths about education in Canada. The major myths which have held back Canadian democracy and Canadian progress are:

1. Anybody with the will to do so can get ahead in this country and rise to the top, no matter what his education, providing he works hard.

2. Our colleges and universities are truly democratic.

3. Most students work their way through college.

4. Bright but needy students can usually get a bursary or scholarship.

5. Those who don't attend college have only themselves to blame.

Briefly, Professor Porter showed that Canadian universities are pastures for the privileged, that upward mobility in our industrial society is largely a myth, that our attitudes towards education are apathetic, that there is a staggering amount of human waste in the land because so many Canadians are badly trained and educated.

Porter states[2] that the inequalities that exist in the social class system arise in part from the inadequacy of educational institutions. Thus as the corporate system becomes even more firmly established, the inequalities that arise because of parental position can be overcome only through a more open educational system.

Porter demonstrates by statistics, through Dominion Bureau

1 Porter, John, The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.
2 Ibid., p. 129.

of Statistics figures, that higher education in Canada is a privilege of the upper classes. More than half of the university students studied by D.B.S. in its 1956 investigation of their incomes and expenditures reported that their fathers were proprietors, managers, or professionals. Only 5.1 per cent of the students' fathers were classified as "labour" though this class makes up 20.5 per cent of the population.

Almost one-quarter of the students surveyed said that they had to postpone or water down their university training for lack of funds.

Only five per cent of the undergraduate student income came from scholarships, prizes, and bursaries. Only one-third of student income came from summer jobs. The median expenditure for the educational year was $1,209; the median savings from a summer job was $507.

Children of the top four classes (out of eight) in Canada are heavily over-represented at university. Class One children, with the highest paid fathers, are ten times over represented. The lower three classes plus farmers (a separate group) are under-represented. Half the students attending university come from the top two classes.

It is clear from a study of The Vertical Mosaic that the upper class in Canada is self-perpetuating, that in Porter's words "little has been done to remove barriers imposed by social conditions on the individual's educational opportunity."[1]

Men and women who ought to be planning the new Canada - its cities, its social fabric, its political structure - are

1 Ibid., p. 130.

employed in menial and often simple tasks because economic conditions forced them to leave school too soon.

Professors Jackson and Fleming of the Ontario College of Education have stated that society squanders the priceless human resources available to it. These two researchers have estimated that the nation is utilizing to the full "the talents of probably no more than one-third of our academically gifted young men and women."

In Ontario, Professor Fleming's survey shows, one-quarter of those who don't go to college or university have a better scholastic record than one-half who do. In Fleming's sample of 8,380 students, there were 1,423 who had a Grade XII average of more than seventy per cent, who did not go on to higher education. There were 3,281 who had an average lower than seventy. Of this group nearly half - 1,535 - were able to afford higher learning. It is noteworthy that the students who didn't go almost equalled the numbers, with poorer marks, who did go. The same study makes it clear that sixty-six per cent of those highschool students uncertain about going to college or university would definitely go if they received a bursary.

Class in Canada, Porter has shown, determines the amount of education available. As a result the bottom third of Canadian society has little upward social mobility to look forward to. Porter thinks it would take at least a full generation of completely free higher education to change these attitudes; and he adds that a living allowance would perhaps be needed to accompany the free tuition before working-class

youths of proven ability could take advantage of the opportunity.

Broom and Selznick[1] state that in general, children from the lower-classes do not have as much opportunity to obtain an education or as much interest in it as those from the upper strata. Because of financial pressure and less motivation, some drop out of school as soon as they can. The educational ladder clearly leads to higher occupations, upper social statuses, and prestigeful styles of life. Without education one has lower horizons, occupationally, socially, culturally.

Some children of lower origins, according to Barber,[2] are upwardly mobile by virtue of the availability of schooling, persistence and success in school, and entry into some higher status occupation to which their education admits them. In this case, education operates to change social position. Similar views are expressed by Riessman and Pearl in New Careers for the Poor.[3]

The apprehension of the poor toward society is expressed by Menzies.[4] The poor suffer from wretched housing, poor diets, inferior educational opportunities, excessive rates of illness, and inadequate medical attention. To them technological progress is not a blessing but a menace as they cannot progress because of a lack of adequate education.

1 Broom and Selznick, Sociology. New York, N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1963, p. 466.
2 Barber, Bernard, Social Stratification. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1957, p. 395.
3 Riessman, F., and Pearl, A., New Careers for the Poor. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1965, p. 165.
4 Menzies, M. W., Poverty in Canada. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Pool Elevators, 1965, p. 6.

The importance of education to the economically disadvantaged is continually emphasized by writers in this field. Dixon[1] emphasizes importance of education in overcoming poverty, as it is the chance of the upward thrust in life that really propels individuals out of the swamps of poverty. The challenge to us all, according to March[2], is to translate our findings into meaning for the poverty groups by such programmes as the "head start" operation in the United States, particular attention to potential school "dropouts" and some kind of work study programme for the older student who requires some aid to remain in school.

Education is not merely an article of consumption; it is the major channel of inter class mobility and the door to opportunity. This view of Kolko[3] would make financial assistance to college students of the utmost importance for the improvement of society.

Increasingly, education is suggested as the route of poverty. For education to be a real help for poor children, they must finish college or technical school according to Becker.[4] In education, we must not overlook the difficulty of obtaining true equality of opportunity. To enable the poor to take advantage of educational opportunity will require that many influences that at present retard their educational

1 Dixon, W. G., Meeting Poverty. Special Planning Secretariat, Privy Council Office, Ottawa, p. 2.
2 March, M. S., "Poverty: How Much will the War Cost?" Social Service Review, XXXIX, June 1965, pp. 141 - 156.
3 Kolko, Gabriel, Wealth and Power in America, New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher, 1965, p. 113.
4 Becker, Howard S., Social Problems, A Modern Approach. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1967, p. 503.

achievement be overcome. There must be better teachers and schools, signs of economic advance among those who have had higher education, and financial assistance that can give reasonable hope of attending college. These advances will require sweeping changes in teacher preparation, reshaping colleges for greater flexibility, the development of a positive college climate, and the provision of scholarships, fellowships and financial aid.

Sexton in Education and Income[1] claims that the educational and occupational aspirations of lower-income students should be raised by convincing them that they can and should continue in school - even into college. Students should be convinced that education can be extremely useful and valuable to them in later life and that advanced levels of education are usually necessary to qualify for many of the rewards of adult life (higher income, more rewarding work, greater prestige, more security, broader participation in social, cultural and intellectual life.)

The above views are supported by Stuart[2] who points out that the single factor that characterizes the greatest number of the poor, apart from lack of money, is lack of education. Nearly two out of three low-income families are headed by persons with no more than a grammar school education. Young and Mack[3] indicate that one of the functions of educational structures is the conferring of status. When the system of

1 Sexton, Patricia, Education and Income. New York: The Viking Press, 1961, p. 273.
2 Stuart, Maxwell S., The Poor Among Us - Challenge and Opportunity. Special Planning Secretariat, Privy Council, Ottawa.
3 Young, K. and Mack, R., Sociology and Social life. New York: Northwestern University American Book Co., 1959, p. 267.

formal education is examined in society, we see that there are variations in the amount and quality of education received according to one's income, occupation, race and region. Each of these variables has consequences, therefore, for the stratification system, not only in its own right, but to the degree that it influences education and hence life chances.

Justification of the Study

It is fairly obvious that the questionnaire and interview techniques are used extensively to obtain data for analysis. These are techniques of the present: they enable the collection of data on various aspects of student participation, but only after great expenditure of time and money. The analysis of such data is sometimes cumbersome but may help students who will wish to come to colleges in future years.

By the proper use of existing data it may be possible not only to rapidly determine socio-economic characteristics of participants, but also to do so in sufficient time in order that the result may be of value in aiding students financially who otherwise would not attend an institution of higher learning. In this way Canada's standard of living would be higher if our educational investment included all students who are academically capable.

Community (junior and regional) colleges are accessible to all, theoretically, without respect to social class, colour, race, degree of affluence, parentage, or prior educational experiences. Also community colleges are by nature "open-door" institutions, that is, no student shall be denied admission

because of the location of his residence or because of his educational background or ability. The community college program offers a wide variety of courses in both the academic and career fields. The college itself is situated close to population centres and takes care of local needs for education past high school. Despite the many advantages which the college offer, there is nevertheless, barriers often invisible and unconsciously imposed which would prove detrimental to a certain class of student, namely the "economically disadvantaged" or "poor". These barriers, which often arise because of administrative expediency, may have the effect of rendering the colleges inaccessible to the poor, who is often educationally handicapped, and lacks the necessary "know-how" to cope with a bureaucratic system.

The problem of the economically disadvantaged student is often not only financial but also that of being unable to adhere to certain behaviour patterns which middle class youth and their parents find more facile than does the lower class. Mass education, to be effective, will have to consider the poor student also in terms of being culturally deprived, too. It will have to take into account that the boy whose father works on an assembly line is less likely to have books in his home or know anything about how to get into college than is the boy whose father is a college graduate. These things must be considered and some system of compensation must be worked out to deal with them. The "poor" student's problem is further enhanced not by scoring on a test but to arrange to take the test on a particular date; not a problem of health but of getting to a physician for an examination on a certain day.

Then the economically disadvantaged student is further hindered in our society as his parents are not aware of the advantages that education may bring to their children. Rossides[1] states a positive correlation between the general class position of parents and the education of their children has been established in every country where this relationship has been studied. In general, education in Canada is structured both to satisfy the needs of a middle-class society (as a public, tax-supported structure it aims at universal literacy, and its stresses abstract but up-to-date knowledge) and to favour the educational chances of the middle and upper classes (as the bearers and believers of bourgeois values and beliefs, the families in these classes are in a better position than other families to put their children through schools and colleges.)

The economically disadvantaged youth, unable to recognize the advantages of a higher education, often as early as junior high school, "gives-up" trying to maintain good marks. His home environment is not one which encourages concentration and study. He becomes "tracked" into dull, dead end, easy vocational subjects in high school and emerges "unconvinced", "uninspired", and "uprepared" for the possibilities of acquiring higher education. The counsellors and teachers may well label this student "hopeless", "dull", and a "seat warmer". The student responds with the attitude why work at school when he cannot envision a "college" future because of financial straits at home.

1 Rossides, Daniel W., Society as a Functional Process: An Introduction to Sociology. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co., 1968, p. 263.

. The colleges find it difficult to reach out to the reluctant scholar to develop an interest in higher education. Colleges rely on high school counsellors to relay college information to potential candidates. The economically disadvantaged student will in all probability never hear about his community college program from the counselor who has already "labeled" the student "not college potential". The hopeless disadvantaged youngster with no brothers or sisters in college, no parent who made it through high-school, no friend in college to give counsel and information, has little chance to qualify as a potential student in the college setting.

R. A. Jenness' study of Poor Families in Vancouver[1] indicates that the problem of the educational attainments of the poor seems to be the failure, for many complex reasons, of both adult and adolescent either to perceive the need for additional educational or vocational skills or to find ways of using the opportunities open to acquire them. Also the poor appear to be disadvantaged compared to other social groups. Financial aid for the poor is not readily available. Society gives money to "sure-risk" persons, but the "high-risk", that is the needy student, who does not have a scholastically high record is further restricted in his finances. The federal government provides interest-free loans and a generous system of scholarships and bursaries to university students whose future income levels will probably far exceed those in the poverty

1 Jenness, R. A., Urban Need in Canada, 1965, Section V, Vancouver. Ottawa: The Canadian Welfare Council, 1965, p. 39.

category. But no such liberal sources of financial capital are available to persons in the least skilled educational levels who probably need the additional education most of all.

Free education of itself will not solve the dilemma of society's poor; that much should be obvious. It is not merely lack of money that conspires against the lower classes; it is the total social environment. The subconscious Canadian attitude that higher education is the preserve of the elite needs to be changed.

The Canadian Welfare Council's detailed study of the urban poor in 1965 gives insight into the attitude of the poor to higher education.

In summary it states:

1 The economically disadvantaged measures himself by the modest attainments of family and neighborhood, with their lack of mental stimulation and possibly their incomprehension of intellectual interests.

2 He is living where the immediate concrete problems are so compelling that there is little family influence toward establishing the long-range view, to put off the immediate if short-lived status and security of an unskilled job.

3 He goes to school hungry or half-hungry.

4 He goes to school tired, from flats in which children do not get their rest through noise or cold or crowding.

5 He loses time by being sent home with lice or impetigo. He is re-infected and there are many short drop-outs before the final drop-out.

The insistent press campaign against drop-outs has convinced

large numbers of people that their children ought to be educated; but it has not shown them how they can get that education. In Toronto, the Welfare Council discovered that ninety-four per cent of the poor families interviewed wanted their children to go to college; yet only fourteen per cent were able even to partially finance a higher education. The optimism shown by these parents is indeed remarkable when you consider that in all probability their children will never achieve the expected educational goal.

Berton, in The Smug Minority[1] points out that this is in reality a blunt appeal for educational subsidies. The choice is really a simple one according to Berton who states that we can pay for the poor to receive education now and get value for our money; or we can pay them later, when they go on social assistance, and in effect toss our money out into the streets.

The barriers which the colleges erect are as a rule designed to ease the flow of the masses of students into college, to get full information about new students in time to counsel them, and to keep enrollments within the limits of existing resources and facilities. At Vancouver City College, for example, the "open door" policy is so only to the extent that a person is first in line to get the subjects he requires. A certain number of students are accepted into a course and then the class is closed. A student would then have to take another subject in its place and often might be short one or two

1 Berton, Pierre, The Smug Minority. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1968, p. 144.

appropriate courses. Vancouver City College has a deadline for admission at each semester and former students are given first choice in selecting their program. As the college operates on a tri-mester system, each student must be prepared at least twice a year to wait in long lineups to try and obtain the course subjects desired. Often classes are closed as early as the second day of registration as a means of controlling enrollments. Such a move may well discourage the economically disadvantaged student just assurely as would a selective admissions policy based on the high-school performance record.

Also VCC does not extensively advertise its programs in the local newspapers, as the college is at present overcrowded, so information of the new semester may often be passed by "word of mouth" among the students attending the college. In this way a further barrier is created amongst the disadvantaged student as he is not likely to come into contact with a student who "knows the ropes." Still, with mounting pressure for admission, delays in the construction of new facilities and tight instructional budgets, VCC is not able to meet the needed demand for its services. Thus the chances of a disadvantaged student being admitted to the college is very small indeed.

Some procedures for obtaining financial aid are in effect discriminatory. Applications for financial aid often require an earlier due-date than applications for admission, because of the work required to determine need and allocate the often scarce scholarship funds. Yet the uncertain disadvantaged

senior who delays action until he completes his last term in high-school may find that he is admissible but ineligible to apply for financial aid. Many sources of financial aid are discriminatory, for example, only for students whose father belonged to a certain organization, or for native Indians only, or for women only. Admission and financial aid are often inseparable for the disadvantaged applicant, but there is reason to believe that a considerable portion of the aid goes to students who have already decided to enroll, whether or not aid is forthcoming. Applicants who are judged to be "good risks" by virtue of their steady performance in high-school, compliance with deadlines and instructions on application blanks, family background, and appearance are more apt to be first in line to seek and obtain financial aid than the "high risk" late applicant who submits a messy application lacking proper signatures. The latter candidate is more likely than not to come from a poor family with no prior experience with college procedures and a fairly strong feeling of suspicion about the whole educational establishment.

Applications for financial aid tend to be very complex forms. For example, the Canada Student Loan Application is an intricate four page document which would stifle a disadvantaged student by its assumptions about income and assets which underlie the form for financial aid, and are totally irrelevant to the lives of the very poor. The very terminology may be unfamiliar to the semi-illiterate parent: assets and liabilities, endowments and trust funds, annuities and investments. The parent may also be quite unwilling to

cooperate in any way to make it possible for the disadvantaged young man or woman to attend college, especially if a job is in prospect. Also the adult who is forced by circumstance to apply for public welfare for his children in time of need, may see the college financial aid in the same perspective, and the comparison is scarcely conducive to his seeking college financial aid for his teenager. Long, unhappy experiences with welfare workers has made the poor skeptical, even distrustful, of college loan programs and of the counselors who offer their help in negotiating such aid.

Finally, the disadvantaged tend to find the community college inaccessible because of a serious communications gap. College catalogues are probably the least effective medium for communication with non-students, at least as they are presently written.[1] Enrolled students have long been the best communicators about the college, as purveyors of factual information, orientation, and a certain amount of guidance. The disadvantaged are in effect denied access to the kind of assistance which students can give in recruitment and enrollment, because such help is not yet institutionalized. Student-to-student help is extended to brothers and sisters and cousins, to neighbours and fellow worshippers, and to friends. The poor, low achieving high-school student lacks such help, when his family includes school drop-outs and his friends are disinterested in further education as an instrument

1 Knoell, D. M., "Are our Colleges Really Accessible to the Poor", Junior College Journal, October 1968, p. 9.

of mobility. Students can be organized to perform the communicating function for the college. But at present the open-door philosophy tends to mediate against planned communication and active recruitment of the disadvantaged to the community college.

Little attention has been given to the so-called nominal tuition and fees charged by colleges. (VCC fees at present are about one half of university fees for the same course load.) Fees are an important deterrent to the enrollment of the disadvantaged. However, they are inconsequential so long as procedure details make the college inaccessible. It is doubtful if colleges discriminate or exclude the disadvantaged willfully, nor are they conscious of their acts which become barriers to admission. Pressures are increasing to "tighten" procedures, while avoiding selective admissions and increased tuition and fees. The "number crisis" soars at the college level and an enrollment limit therefore has to be established. As tightening occurs, accessibility dwindles for the disadvantaged for the very reasons which make them high risks - postponement of decision making, failure to meet deadlines, uncertain motivation, and a certain resentment toward the establishment which keeps them in a state of disadvantage.

Poverty Defined

The term "poor" is misleading. The poor don't agree on whether they are poor. Some deny that they are poor; judged by the standards of their neighbours or by their past way of

living, "poor" may indeed mislead. Others consider themselves poor, but even these respond to their poverty differently, unpredictably: they see poverty as a challenge, and dream of breaking out of it; or perhaps they see poverty as a conqueror, and yield to despair.

Only the poor can know poverty; only they can understand it. The economist who tries to define poverty with statistics can't know poverty - nor can the reporter who spends hours observing the poor, interviewing them, but retreating at night to the luxury of a five course meal and the comfort of a clean room. Nor, indeed, can the social worker who injects himself - and his background and his prejudices - into the neighborhoods of the poor by the day or even by the year.

Poverty is difficult to define; it is difficult to measure. Who can measure a man's needs? A man's longings?

Many private and government economists call a family poor if its yearly income is below $3000; an individual, if he earns less than $1500. By this standard, one fifth of the nation's people are poor. Whatever the figure, economists admit that it is arbitrary - that some below it cannot by any definition be adjudged poor, that some above it should be. Poverty, then, has many faces, many forms, many nuances. There is no simple way to describe the poor, no simple way to solve their problems.

The extent of poverty in this country may be measured by data from the 1961 Census of Canada.

Poverty is defined in terms of those who are denied the minimal levels of health, housing, food and education that our

present state of technological and scientific knowledge specifies for life as it is lived in this country.

The poor are often poor because there are more members in their families and incomes per person are therefore much smaller. Their education is much lower than that of the middle class and is insufficient to enable them to get better or more permanent jobs, or even to take part in retraining courses. They are aware of their economic uselessness at earlier ages. The majority have less than Grade VIII education.

The Canadian Welfare Council report 1965 referred to the North American poverty standard of an annual income of $3,300 for a family of four; and the Report of the Special Committee of the Senate of Aging, February, 1966, mentioned a minimum annual income of $2,190 for a family of two. On these bases, data from the 1961 Census of Canada indicate that a third of the 2,270,276 wage-earning families are poor.

The Canadian Welfare Council report on Urban Need in Canada, 1965, found a median household income of $3,300 for the entire sample (of 201 families) in four Canadian cities. Over a third of the sample depended entirely on some form of public assistance for their income; while only six per cent depended entirely on wages. Seventy-two per cent of the male heads of families in the sample had no high school training; (23 per cent of the total achieved less than four years of elementary school; and 49 per cent, Grades V to VIII).

The Ontario Federation of Labour defines poor as "those who cannot now maintain a decent standard of living and whose

basic needs exceed their means and resources for satisfying them."[1] The OFL lists three degrees of poverty: first, privation - want of comforts of necessities of life; second, poverty - in want, living a subsistence level of existence; and third, destitution - a condition of abject poverty.

Peter Townsend, the British sociologist has given us an interesting definition of poverty.[2]

> "Individuals and families whose financial resources and/or whose other resources including their educational and occupational skills, the condition of their environment at home and at work and their material possessions, fall seriously below those commanded by the average person or family in society are in poverty."

Daniel Rossides approached the definition of poverty from a slightly different attitude. He claims that until the twentieth century, poverty was an objective problem of biological sustenance, poverty meant physical hardship, starvation and disease. Today poverty has an added dimension - it is no longer merely a problem of society against nature, but it is now a problem of society against itself. The key to understanding this new aspect of poverty is that it is vastly different to be poor in a rich society than it is to be poor in a poor society.

The 1961 Canadian Census revealed that 2,393,155 urban Canadians were living in conditions which can only be described as destitute. Of these, 1,862,820 were living in family groups (the average size of the family being four) whose total

1 Berton, op. cit., p. 93.
2 Townsend, Peter, "Conference on Socially Handicapped Families", Paris: UNESCO, February, 1964, p. 1.

annual earnings did not reach the $2,000 mark. The remainder, 530,335, were single persons living alone whose annual income was less than $1,000. There were an additional half million destitute people living "on farms"; their total family income came to less than $600 a year.

Besides the three million Canadians who are destitute, there are, according to the census estimates, two million more living in "poverty" and another two million or more living in "privation". In the first group are those urban families whose annual incomes are less than $3,000 but more than $2,000. In the second group are those who live in urban families earning less than $4,000 annually or single individuals making less than $2,000 annually.

There are two approaches which may well be used to define the "economically disadvantaged". One procedure is to emphasize the definition in terms of "class" characteristics, that is, economic role or income; the other involves the "cultural" status of a person, that is his style of life. The important point to remember is that there will obviously be other dimensions, such as religion and education that will help delineate the 'lower class'.

As Miller reports[1] there are many problems incurred in the use of any of these indicators in defining the economically disadvantaged. He suggests that an income criterion is of more use today than others previously mentioned in the definition of the lower class.

1 Shostak, A.B., and Gomberg, W., New Perspectives on Poverty. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965, p. 24.

The advantage of utilizing the economic criterion, and particularly the income definition, as Miller points out, is that it specifies a socio-economic category toward which a policy can be directed.

The income criterion has several components; the level of income, the stability or regularity of income, and the source of income. The knowledge in this present report to make such a fine classification of these components is lacking.

The determination of the poverty level then, is somewhat arbitrary. However, the following criteria were used for determining if a student was disadvantaged economically, that is at a poverty level. The respondent's own reported earnings as well as the earnings of the respondent's parents, or spouse were considered. If the student reported that he lived with his parents then the maximum of the student's reported earnings plus the maximum of the parent's earnings would be totaled and divided by the reported number of members in the family unit. If the resultant average maximum possible earning were less than $1,000 for the year, then the family was considered to be in the poverty class. For example, if a respondent stated his total earnings for 1968 as under $1,000 and that his parents earned from $2,000 to $2,999 a year, then the total possible earnings for the two parents and one student, that is three persons, would be considered as $1,000 plus $2,999 for a total of $3,999 or an average of $1,333 per person. This family, therefore, would not be classed as poverty. This may not be too satisfactory since a student who reported under $1,000 a year may actually have nil earnings, and his parents' earnings could have been a low of $2,000 per year. (The questionnaire

was designed in such a manner as to record earnings by group, that is, under $1,000 a year; $1,000 - $1,999 a year; $2,000 - $2,999 a year; $3,000 - $3,999 a year; $4,000 - $5,999 a year; and $6,000 and over a year) The total earnings then for this family unit of three could be a low of $2,000, or an average of $666 per person, which would then classify them as poverty. It was arbitrarily decided to use the upper levels in each earning category. This could in effect classify a lesser number of persons as being in the poverty area.

This is not, however, as serious as would first appear. There were only three instances out of the 315 student sample where using the lower levels of reported incomes would have placed the family in the poverty class. In other words, even though the lower level was used, only three members of the sample would have a family unit where the average income per person was less than $1,000 per year.

The same procedure was followed in determining the economic level of a student residing with his or her spouse.

In the case of a student living with a friend or alone, just the respondent's reported income was considered, and if that reported income was less than $1,000, then the respondent was considered in the poverty class. In a situation where the respondent lived with relatives, the respondent's income plus any reported parental contribution would be considered when determining the economic classification.

Once again the determination of a poverty class was based on the maximum average income for the family unit. An average maximum income of less than $1,000 per family member would

place the respondent in the poverty classification.

Problem

The central problem of this study is to determine the socio-economic characteristics of participants in community college classes; to analyse certain aspects of those college students who are identified as economically disadvantaged; and to suggest some of the factors which might contribute to a lesser proportion of economically disadvantaged students attending the community college.

Hypothesis

There are two hypothesis to be tested. The first is that the ratio of economically disadvantaged students attending Vancouver City College is below the normal ratio of economically disadvantaged in the City of Vancouver from which the college draws its clientele. The second hypothesis is that the community college is rendered inaccessible to the potential student in the poverty class (economically disadvantaged) by a series of restrictions and regulations which makes obtainment of what little financial aid is available extremely unlikely.

Plan of the Study

The method used in this research study was the analytical survey method and also a review of the literature and appropriate documents from a community college.

Vancouver City College was the source of the survey. This

college has been in operation since 1965 - the first college operating in British Columbia. The purpose of the random sample of the students at Vancouver City College was to determine the economic level of the participants, whether they came from the lower, middle or upper income brackets. The sample is "representative" of the different career and academic sections of the college and is a reflection in minature of the whole college.

CHAPTER II

PLAN AND PROCEDURE

The Universe

For the purpose of this study the participants of 390 Vancouver City College classes that were in session during the week period of February 10, 1969 to February 14, 1969 constituted the universe.

The 390 classes were stratified by type, that is academic or technical as indicated in Table 1. A random sample was then taken from those classes in session between 10:30 and 11:30 in the morning and between 6:45 and 8:15 in the evening, in such a manner that there would be at least a ten per cent selection of enrollment. With this in mind, fourteen academic classes with an enrollment of 440 students (13.5 per cent of the total academic enrollment) and three technical classes with an enrollment of 85 students (18.2 per cent of the total technical enrollment) comprised the sample classes.

Questionnaires were completed and returned by 248 academic students (7.65 per cent of the total academic enrollment) and 67 technical students (14.40 per cent of the total technical enrollment). The total returns were 315 (8.5 per cent of the overall college enrollment) and it is these participants from the selected classes who made up the sample of the universe, and data on socio-economic characteristics were collected.

TABLE 1

Grouping of Vancouver City College classes for selection of sample and class breakdown, February 1969.

Grouping of Classes	The Universe		Sample of the Universe			
			Classes		Questionnaires Completed	
	No. Classes	Enrollment	No.	Enrollment	No.	% of Universe
Academic	319	3243	14	440	248	7.65
Technical	71	467	3	85	67	14.40
TOTAL	390	3710	17	525	315	8.50

Data

Data were obtained from the sample on socio-economic characteristics as well as impressions regarding financial assistance.

Data on sex, age, income of respondent, occupation and hours of work of respondent, number of persons in the household, number of persons financially dependant upon the respondent, with whom the respondent lives, and occupation and earnings of parents or spouse were recorded. Also, information as to financial aid received was recorded.

The Procedure

The instructor of each of the seventeen classes from which the data were to be collected was personally contacted, and his cooperation requested in making the survey. The distribution and completion of the questionnaire was done at the beginning of the class session. The instructors distributing the questionnaire were asked to make no comments regarding the questionnaire other than to indicate that the student's cooperation was requested. Particularly were they asked not to interpret questions and to have students answer according to their own interpretations.

The data were transferred from the questionnaire to charts for manual sorting and tabulation.

Social status was analysed, using data for the labour force by application of the Blishen scale.[1] The Blishen scale for

1 Blishen, B. R., Canadian Society. Toronto, Ont.: The Macmillan Co. of Canada, Ltd., 1961, pp. 479-484.

determining social class was used in preference to other scales because it was computed on Canadian data and, therefore, may be assumed to be more reliable for the study than scales not completed on Canadian data.

The 315 member sample was analysed to determine if the respondent was economically disadvantaged, that is, in the poverty class. A number of definitions of poverty are available. As previously explained, there are certain problems involved in determining any positive criteria for judging and labeling the economically disadvantaged. In this report it was arbitrarily decided to include those respondents whose reported earnings would be $1,000 or less per year for each family member.

Further analysis of the sample was conducted to determine the extent of financial support extended to these students.

Investigation was also carried out to determine the types of financial aid available to community college students at Vancouver City College, as well as the characteristics of this financial aid.

A limited attempt was then conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of this aid in light of findings concerning the sample, and to give some possible suggestions as to how improvements could be made to give more effective assistance financially to the economically disadvantaged.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

A 315 member sample of Vancouver City College students was investigated to determine certain socio-economic characteristics.

The characteristics of these students that were included in the study are sex, age, place of residence, reported earnings for the year 1968, reported earnings for the family unit during that same time period, and classification according to occupational class.

A further analysis was conducted to define those students who would be considered as economically disadvantaged, the source of financial aid received by the respondents, degree of respondent's knowledge of financial aid available.

Sex

Men outnumbered women in the sample under study nearly two to one. This ratio varied somewhat according to the classification of students as "career" or "academic". In the case of academic students, the ratio of male to female students was 2.6 to 1. This trend, however, reversed for the career section of the sample where women respondents outnumbered the men by a ratio of 1.5 to 1.

A breakdown of numbers of respondents by sex is given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, by age group and according to course status.

Age Group in Years	Status	Male		Female		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under 20	Career	7		13		20	
	Academic	50		31		81	
	Total	57	27.6	44	40.3	101	32.1
20 - 24	Career	15		7		22	
	Academic	88		20		108	
	Total	103	50.0	27	24.8	130	41.3
25 - 34	Career	4		6		10	
	Academic	37		11		48	
	Total	41	20.0	17	15.6	58	18.4
35 - 44	Career	1		11		12	
	Academic	4		4		8	
	Total	5	2.4	15	13.8	20	6.3
45 - 54	Career	-		3		3	
	Academic	-		3		3	
	Total	-	-	6	5.5	6	1.9
TOTAL	Career	27		40		67	
	Academic	179		69		248	
	Total	206	100.0	109	100.0	315	100.0

Age

The age grouping of the 315 member sample will also be found in Table 2. Ages were classified according to groups as defined in Canadian Census publications.[1] Five classifications were used which range from the under 20 age limit to the upper range of 45 to 54 age group. One hundred thirty students (41.3 per cent) of the sample were in the twenty to twenty-four age group. The under 20 age group accounted for the second largest section, 101 students (32.1 per cent). Eighty-four students (26.6 per cent) were in the three age categories, that is those age groups 25 years and over, often referred to as mature students.

A greater percentage of women students in the sample were found at the younger age level. For example, 40.3 per cent of women as compared to 27.3 per cent of men were under age 20, for a ratio of 1.4 women to men. This predominance in numbers of women to men was also evident at the upper or "older" age levels where 21 women (19.3 per cent) were 35 years or over as compared with five men (2.4 per cent) in this same age range. In the middle age categories, 103 men (50.0 per cent), and 27 women (24.8 per cent) were aged 20 to 24 years with the remaining 20 per cent men and 15.6 per cent women aged 25 to 34. If those age categories twenty-five years and over are considered then 34.9 per cent of the female sample would be in the "mature" age range as compared to only 22.4 per cent of the male sample.

1 Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts. Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1963.

Career and Academic Students

The percentages of career and academic students in the under 20 year age group were virtually the same, that is, 30.3 per cent of the career students and 32.5 per cent of the academic students. A greater proportion of academic students (63.1 per cent) were found in the 20 to 34 age group than career students (47.0 per cent). However, this trend was reversed for the 35 and over age group where 22.7 per cent of the career students were in this age group as contrasted to only 4.4 per cent of the academic students. In other words nearly five times the proportion of career students are studying at the college during their middle age years (over 35 years of age) as are academic students.

Place of Residence

The respondents to the questionnaire were asked to indicate with whom they had lived during the past year. Five categories were provided for as indicated in Table 3. By far the largest group recorded that they were residing with their parents. One hundred eighty-six members of the sample (59.0 per cent) were in this group. A larger proportion of men, 63.6 per cent of the male sample (131 male students) lived with parents as compared with 50.5 per cent of the female sample (55 female students). Just under one fifth of the sample indicated that they lived with their spouse (17.2 per cent). Of the 54 students living with their spouse, 26 were female (23.8 per cent of the female sample) and 28 were male (13.6 per cent of the male sample). In other words there is a larger proportion

TABLE 3

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to place of residence.

Residence	Status	Male		Female		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Parents	Career	18		16		34	
	Academic	113		39		152	
	Total	131	63.6	55	50.5	186	59.0
Spouse	Career	4		10		14	
	Academic	24		16		40	
	Total	28	13.6	26	23.8	54	17.2
Other relative	Career	2		3		5	
	Academic	7		7		14	
	Total	9	4.4	10	9.2	19	6.0
Friend	Career	-		3		3	
	Academic	13		4		17	
	Total	13	6.3	7	6.4	20	6.3
Alone	Career	4		6		10	
	Academic	19		3		22	
	Total	23	11.2	9	8.3	32	10.2
Not listed	Career	-		2		2	
	Academic	2		-		2	
	Total	2	.9	2	1.8	4	1.3
TOTAL	Career	27		40		67	
	Academic	179		69		248	
	Total	206	100.0	109	100.0	315	100.0

from the overall sample who are wives than husbands. A small proportion of students were found living alone, with friends, and with relatives other than parents or spouse.

A greater proportion of academic students preferred to live at home than did career students (61.0 per cent academic as compared to 51.5 per cent career). This would seem reasonable when it is remembered that the academic student is essentially a younger student than the career student. The proportion of career students (21.2 per cent) living with a spouse is therefore, somewhat greater than for academic students (16.1 per cent). A greater proportion of career students (15.2 per cent) indicated a preference to live alone when compared with the academic student (8.8 per cent). There was, therefore, every indication from the characteristic of residence that career students are considerably more independent and older than the academic students, preferring to live as a married couple or alone, whereas the academic student preferred to live "at home", that is, with parents.

Earnings

The earnings of the respondents were reported in Table 4. The largest single group of the sample indicated earnings less than $1,000. This group was comprised of 97 students (30.8 per cent of the sample). Seventy-two students (22.9 per cent) were in the $1,000 - $1,999 category with 45 students (14.3 per cent) reporting earnings between two and three thousand dollars. Only 13 students (4.1 per cent) indicated earnings in excess of $6,000 for 1968. The largest single group were

TABLE 4

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to earnings reported for the year 1968.

Earnings	Status	Male		Female		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under $1000	Career	7		11		18	
	Academic	49		30		79	
	Total	56	27.2	41	37.7	97	30.8
$1000 - $1999	Career	12		7		19	
	Academic	46		7		53	
	Total	58	28.1	14	12.8	72	22.9
$2000 - $2999	Career	4		7		11	
	Academic	31		3		34	
	Total	35	17.0	10	9.2	45	14.3
$3000 - $3999	Career	3		2		5	
	Academic	16		5		21	
	Total	19	9.2	7	6.4	26	8.2
$4000 - $5999	Career	1		4		5	
	Academic	15		3		18	
	Total	16	7.8	7	6.4	23	7.3
$6000 - & over	Career	-		1		1	
	Academic	9		3		12	
	Total	9	4.4	4	3.6	13	4.1
Not listed	Career	-		8		8	
	Academic	13		18		31	
	Total	13	6.3	26	23.9	39	12.4
TOTAL	Career	27		40		67	
	Academic	179		69		248	
	Total	206	100.0	109	100.0	315	100.0

females reporting earnings of under $1,000. There were 41 females in this category (37.7 per cent of the female sample) as compared to 56 males (27.2 per cent of the male sample).

Overall there was a slight tendency for the male respondent to report a higher earning rate than for the female. It was also observed that the rate of females not indicating their earning category was about four times that of males (23.9 per cent females as compared with 6.3 per cent male).

The lower earnings, that is under $2,000 per year, of both academic and career students from the sample was virtually the same, that is, 56.1 per cent of the career students and 53.0 per cent of the academic students. The ratio of career and academic students in the other earning groups reported was fairly similar with the one exception of students reporting earnings over $6,000 per year. One career student (1.5 per cent) reported over $6,000 earnings, whereas 12 academic students (4.8 per cent) reported in this earning classification.

Family Unit

From the point of view of an analysis of students to determine a poverty level, or those who should be classed as "economically disadvantaged" a record of earnings of the family unit would be of most value. To determine the family unit earnings, the respondent's earnings plus those of either his parents or spouse were considered. These persons were classed as multiple family units. Respondents living with friends, relatives other than parents or spouse, or alone, were considered as a single family unit. Both multiple and single family

units were reported as family unit earnings in Table 5. A considerable change was now noted in the financial position of the 315 member sample. Over 50 per cent of the sample lived in a family unit where income was in excess of $6,000 per year. Specifically, 180 students (57.2 per cent) were in this earning category, with 120 male students (58.2 per cent) and 60 female students (55.0 per cent). Fifty-seven students (18.1 per cent) reported earnings between $4,000 and $6,000 per year, with percentages of men and women in the family unit in this category nearly the same (17.5 per cent men and 19.3 per cent women). Thirty students (9.5 per cent) belonged to a family unit reporting earnings of under $2,000 per year.

Occupational Class

The final classification of the sample was according to occupational class. The occupational class was determined according to the student's reply to the question concerning industry and occupation of either his parent or spouse. The occupational class was divided into nine categories similar to those listed in Canadian Census publications. These categories are indicated in Table 6 along with the numbers of students whose parents or spouse belong to the particular category according to whether the respondents are career or academic students, and according to whether the respondent could be classed as living in a family unit that is economically disadvantaged or not. The poverty classification has previously been defined, but briefly it would apply where the average earnings for all members of the family unit (including

TABLE 5

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to earnings reported of the family unit for the year 1968.

Earnings	Status	Male		Female		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Under $2000	Career	6		1		7	
	Academic	17		6		23	
	Total	23	11.2	7	6.4	30	9.5
$2000 - $2999	Career	-		5		5	
	Academic	9		3		12	
	Total	9	4.4	8	7.4	17	5.4
$3000 - $3999	Career	-		3		3	
	Academic	14		8		22	
	Total	14	6.8	11	10.1	25	7.9
$4000 - $5999	Career	6		6		12	
	Academic	30		15		45	
	Total	36	17.5	21	19.3	57	18.1
$6000 - & over	Career	15		23		38	
	Academic	105		37		142	
	Total	120	58.2	60	55.0	180	57.2
Not listed	Career	-		2		2	
	Academic	4		-		4	
	Total	4	1.9	2	1.8	6	1.9
TOTAL	Career	27		40		67	
	Academic	179		69		248	
	Total	206	100.0	109	100.0	315	100.0

TABLE 6

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to occupational class, and poverty or non-poverty classification.

Occupational Class	Career		Academic		Total			
	Poverty	Non-Poverty	Poverty	Non-Poverty	Poverty		Non-Poverty	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%	No.	%
Managerial	1	10	-	47	1	6.3	57	19.1
Professional & Technical	1	7	-	47	1	6.3	54	18.1
Clerical	-	5	1	19	1	6.3	24	8.0
Sales	-	6	-	22	-	-	28	9.4
Service & Recreation	-	9	-	18	-	-	27	9.0
Transport & Communication	-	3	1	9	1	6.3	12	4.0
Primary	-	3	1	8	1	6.3	11	3.7
Craftsmen, Production	-	8	-	15	-	-	23	7.7
Labourer	1	3	-	16	1	6.3	19	6.3
Not listed	1	9	9	35	10	62.5	44	14.7
TOTAL	4	63	12	236	16		299	
	67		248		315			

children) is below $1,000 per year per person.

Using this definition then, 16 students were classed as "poverty" or economically disadvantaged. Unfortunately, 54 of the 315 member sample (17.2 per cent) did not indicate information needed to determine occupational class. Of these, 10 persons not indicating the required information were classed as "poverty". In other words, 10 of the 16 students (62.5 per cent) considered to be economically disadvantaged could not be given an occupational classification. This compared with 44 students (14.7 per cent) of the non-poverty group not replying with the needed information. It is significant to note, however, that 111 students (37.2 per cent), by far the largest proportion of non-poverty students came from family units that would be classed as managerial and professional. Fifty-three students (17.7 per cent) reported family unit occupations of a "lower" class nature, that is primary occupations, craftsmen and labourers. Putting it yet another way, there was twice the ratio of students from "upper" class family units as "lower" class. Clerical and sales occupations recorded 52 students (17.4 per cent). Service, recreation, transportation and communication occupations accounted for 39 students (13.0 per cent). Although the numbers of poverty designated students are small and therefore any conclusions at this point should be considered as tentative, nevertheless it should be noted that two students classed as poverty came from family units of a managerial and professional status.

As might be expected, a larger proportion of academic students than career students came from family units involved

in managerial or professional-technical occupations. Nearly 40 per cent (94 students) of the academic students were from this occupational class as compared with 27 per cent (19 students) of the career students. At the opposite end of the occupational scale, that is in the primary, craftsmen, labourer category, 16.5 per cent (39 students) from the academic program were found, while 22.3 per cent (14 students) were from career courses. This would seem to indicate, at least from this sample of students, that college students involved in academic programs come from family units where occupations are of a professional nature as compared with career people where there is a greater trend toward labourer styled occupations for the family unit.

Financial Assistance

Forty-nine of the 315 member sample (15.6) per cent reported receipt of financial assistance for their present semester at Vancouver City College. Of particular interest was the fact that just slightly under one half of the career students reported receiving financial aid. Of the 67 career students surveyed, 31 (46.3 per cent) indicated aid received. On the other hand, 18 of 248 academic students (7.3 per cent) were in receipt of financial assistance. In other words the ratio of career students receiving financial assistance was nearly seven times that of the academic student. The numbers in receipt of financial aid are indicated in Table 7.

TABLE 7

Number of 315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, reporting receipt of financial assistance.

Status	Sample of Universe	Sample Receiving Aid	Per cent of Sample
	No.	No.	
Career	67	31	46.3
Academic	248	18	7.3
TOTAL	315	49	15.6

Sixteen students have been identified as "economically disadvantaged" according to criteria reported earlier in the study. This would indicate that 5.1 per cent of the sample are classed as below the poverty level. Of this number, only one quarter were in receipt of financial assistance according to results of the questionnaire. Once again it must be noted that career students benefited to a greater degree from assistance. From Table 8 it will be observed that three of the four career students considered as economically disadvantaged received financial aid while only one out of the twelve economically disadvantaged academic students received such help.

Source of Financial Aid

From Table 9, a breakdown of the main sources of financial aid will be seen. In certain cases it was possible for a

TABLE 8

Number of 315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, listed as economically disadvantaged (poverty).

Status	Sample of Universe	Economically Disadvantaged		In Receipt of Financial Aid	
	No.	No.	%	No.	%
Career	67	4	6.0	3	75.0
Academic	248	12	4.8	1	8.3
TOTAL	315	16	5.1	4	25.0

recipient to receive aid from more than one source. Therefore, totals will not necessarily agree with those indicated in Table 7.

The most significant figure would be the 266 students (83.7 per cent) who did not receive aid (or at least did not report such aid). The reader should be reminded that indirect aid, that is aid such as room and board by a parent or spouse, is not considered in this context as financial aid. As far as individual support was concerned, the largest ratio of students (5.7 per cent) received B. C. Government Scholarships. And to continue a trend already established, career course students accounted for the greatest number of scholarship recipients. Twelve career course students as compared with six academic students received this aid. The next largest rate of assistance came from the Canada Student Loan. Thirteen students (4.1 per

TABLE 9

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to reported source of financial aid received.

Source of Aid	Status	Male		Female		Total	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
B.C. Gov't. Scholarship	Career	9		3		12	
	Academic	4		2		6	
	Total	13	6.2	5	4.6	18	5.7
Canada Stu. Loan	Career	4		2		6	
	Academic	5		2		7	
	Total	9	4.3	4	3.6	13	4.1
B.C. Gov't. Bursary	Career	1		-		1	
	Academic	1		1		2	
	Total	2	1.0	1	.9	3	.9
Canada Manpower	Career	2		6		8	
	Academic	1		-		1	
	Total	3	1.4	6	5.5	9	2.8
Social Assistance	Career	1		-		1	
	Academic	-		-		-	
	Total	1	.5	-	-	1	.3
Other aid	Career	3		2		5	
	Academic	1		2		3	
	Total	4	1.9	4	3.7	8	2.5
No aid Received	Career	9		27		36	
	Academic	168		62		230	
	Total	177	84.7	89	81.7	266	83.7
TOTAL		209*		109		318*	

* Total greater than number in sample since some respondents indicated financial aid from more than one source.

cent), six career and seven academic, obtained benefits from this loan fund. Canada Manpower, under the Adult Occupational Training Act provided financial support for nine students (2.8 per cent). It is interesting to note that one student was classed as academic. In this particular case the student concerned was enrolled in an "occupational training" course but taking at the time of the survey an academically orientated course. For purpose of this report he was classed as an academic student. There were no other similar cases in the sample. B. C. Government Bursaries, Social Assistance and other aid accounted for the remaining twelve students.

Although B. C. Government Scholarships were awarded to the greatest number of students, the actual financial assistance was the lowest. Aid from this source ranged from $33 to $75 per semester for an average payment of $58. As may be gathered from Table 10, Manpower (Adult Occupational Training Act)

TABLE 10

Financial Assistance received according to source.

Source	Minimum Grant	Maximum Grant	Average Grant
Canada Manpower	$500	$1300	$965
Canada Student Loan	300	1000	596
B. C. Government Scholarship	33	75	58
Social Assistance	2000	2000	2000
Others	50	1770	320

provided the greatest overall assistance with financial allowances ranging from $500 to $1,344 for an average of $965 over a two semester period. Loans from the Federal Government ranged from $300 to $1,000 for an eight month period, or an average per recipient of $596 for the academic year.

The greatest single aid came from Vancouver Social Services (Welfare) who reportedly contributed in the neighbourhood of $2,000 to one family unit. Contributions from other agencies, both private and public, ranged from $50 to $1,770 according to information given in reply to the questionnaire.

Knowledge of Financial Assistance

By far the largest percentage of repondents indicated a knowledge of the availability of financial aid. The information was reported by 85.1 per cent of the career students and 78.7 per cent of the academic students. Surprisingly, percentages of students reporting no knowledge of availability of financial assistance was fairly high, 14.9 per cent and 20.5 per cent for career and academic students respectively. This information was reported in Table 11.

There was little difference in rates of male and female respondent's knowledge of aid available. Slightly greater knowledge of aid on the part of men was noted, 164 of 206 men (79.7 per cent) as compared with 88 (80.7 per cent) of women.

TABLE 11

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to knowledge of financial assistance available to college students.

	Male		Female		Total			
	Career	Academic	Career	Academic	Career		Academic	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	24	140	33	55	57	85.1	195	78.7
No	3	37	7	14	10	14.9	51	20.5
Not answered	-	2	-	-	-		2	.8
TOTAL	27	179	40	69	67		248	

Source of Knowledge of Financial Aid

The 252 members of the sample who reported a knowledge of the availability of financial assistance indicated several main sources of this knowledge, as shown in Table 12. The largest single source of information was listed in the category "others". This included such sources as professional journals, and information supplied by employers or Canada Manpower officers. These sources were most noticeable for career students where 15 of the career students (26.3 per cent) indicated these "other" sources. The Vancouver City College calendar was generally speaking the single most positive source of information. Here again a higher proportion of career students (26.3 per cent) reported this as their main source of information as compared with 15.9 per cent of academic students. None of

TABLE 12

252 members of sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to source of knowledge regarding availability of financial assistance.

Source of Information	Male		Female		Total			
	Career	Academic	Career	Academic	Career		Academic	
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	%	No.	%
Press	2	28	2	4	4	7.1	32	16.4
TV/Radio	-	13	2	3	2	3.5	16	8.2
High School Counsellor	4	21	5	12	9	15.8	33	16.9
VCC Counsellor	3	13	9	3	12	21.0	16	8.2
VCC Publication	8	20	7	11	15	26.3	31	15.9
Friends	-	30	-	5	-	-	35	18.0
Other sources	8	22	7	10	15	26.3	32	16.4
TOTAL	25	147	32	48	57		195	

the career students had knowledge of the matter of financial aid from friends, whereas 18.0 per cent of the academic students heard of assistance from friends. In fact, for the academic student, friends seemed to be the greatest source of information. For the career student, the VCC counsellor was another important source of information accounting for 21 per cent of this group of students, while on the other hand the VCC counsellor had

the second lowest source rate, 8.2 per cent, for academic students. The importance of the mass media as a diseminator of this type of information would come under question. Slightly over 10 per cent of the career students and 20 per cent of the academic students apparently gained information from this source.

CHAPTER IV

TESTING THE HYPOTHESIS

College Ratio of "Economically Disadvantaged" Low

The first hypothesis to be tested was that the ratio of "economically disadvantaged" attending the community college, in this particular case Vancouver City College, is below the normal ratio of economically disadvantaged in the urban area of Vancouver, B. C.

It had been hoped to test this hypothesis by using information collected through the questionnaire and relating this to information contained in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics bulletin.[1]

Unfortunately this was not to be the case. First there was the problem of defining economically disadvantaged. Earnings are only a small part of the determination of poverty. The poverty classed individual tends to be rather an unskilled and irregular worker, from a broken or large family, possibly even physically handicapped or mentally disturbed.[2] Therefore, many other aspects should be considered when determining poverty. M. Kehoe[3] indicates that poverty can be an "alienation from the community..." Even the simple matter of delineating poverty by earnings alone created problems. Just as one example, from the time that this study was commenced to the time the report was written, a period of about a month,

1 Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts. Ottawa, Queen's Printer, 1963.
2 Shostak and Gomberg, op. cit., p. 31
3 Kehoe, Mary, "Measuring Poverty", Canadian Labour, December 1966, p. 8.

the U. S. index of poverty level for a family of four (the standard guide) increased by $50 per year. In other words a family of four in the U. S. would be considered at a poverty level if their income was under $3,300 per year - yet in the time it took to write this report the same family would be classed as in poverty if income was under $3,350 per year. The method of defining poverty for this report has already been stated. (page 23 - 24) Using 1961 Census of Canada information, the labour force for Vancouver is 158,721 persons. Those male and female persons with a wage and salary income under $1,000 were numbered at 18,300 or 11.6 per cent of the labour force. However, it would be possible and entirely probable that is some cases of reported wage and salary incomes listed as say $3,000, that a family unit of four persons would then be living at a poverty level, that is with an average per person income for all members of that family unit of under $1,000. These facts are not available in DBS publications. The publication does list five census tracts within Vancouver where the average male income is less than $3,200 per year, that is the level of poverty considered by some to apply in Canada. Even the use of this figure is unsatisfactory since the size of the family unit is only guessed at. Similarily, the $3,200 figure could well apply to all of Canada, but because of regional difference, be too high, or too low for the Vancouver situation.

It has, therefore, become clear that if further studies on this matter are to be conducted, and statistical comparisons

are to be made, other criteria than presently available will need to be used. Also the use of the questionnaire as the sole means of determining student status in this case is open to serious question. It is the writers belief that a "follow-up" styled interview, to follow the questionnaire would provide a more valid interpretation of the economic position of students.

For the purpose of the present study a figure on the number of economically disadvantaged students in the sample under consideration was given as 16 (5.1 per cent of the sample) in Table 8. If we are prepared to accept statements that the poverty rate, that is those that are economically disadvantaged, runs around one quarter to one third of our population, then we must be prepared to accept this first hypothesis, that is, the proportion of economically disadvantaged attending college is below the proportion of economically disadvantaged existing in general society. In this case the VCC sample has recorded 5.1 per cent at a poverty level while it appears that within society in general the poverty class could well include from 25 per cent to over 30 per cent. It would, therefore, seem that VCC does not have enough students from this economic category, and that the hypothesis that the ratio of economically disadvantaged students attending Vancouver City College is below the normal ratio of economically disadvantaged in the City of Vancouver from which the college draws its clientele.

Obtainment of Financial Aid Restricted

Since the community college concept is developed along the "open-door" policy, that is a policy to the end that no student will be denied admission because of his educational background or ability, one must then conclude that the basic reason (but naturally not the only one) for such a small proportion of poverty classed people attending college is the lack of finances.

This answer would on the surface appear obvious. Since, however, financial aid is made available to at least some students, the next question would be to determine the effectiveness of such aid as far as the economically disadvantaged is concerned. With this in mind the second hypothesis is now discussed. The hypothesis is that present financial assistance is not of aid to the person at a poverty level in such a manner as to encourage his attendance at college.

The 1968 VCC calendar has listed sixteen sources from which financial help is forthcoming. In addition to this there are other sources of financial help not listed in the calendar but known to counsellors. The 1969 calendar will list and describe twenty-four sources of financial aid. These sources of aid plus ten others not listed in the calendar but available are summarized in Table 13.

It must be made very clear in this analysis that the purpose is not to criticize existing agencies who supply financial assistance. It is the purpose to show the degree to which available aid is not of great value to the economically disadvantaged. Of the 34 sources of financial aid, one half

are classed as restrictive, that is, only available to certain groups, for example, native Indians, accountants, children of teachers, women only, members or ex-members of military forces, to name just a few. These restrictions in themselves would effectively eliminate the economically disadvantaged even if they could qualify in other aspects. Eighteen sources, some duplicating the restrictive category depend on prior achievement. It could be assumed that the "high risk" student would not have a previous achievement record of high enough quality to qualify for assistance.

Attendance as a full-time student, that is a student with a course load of five college level subjects is required in over three-quarters of the situations indicated. The student from the poverty class would be the most likely candidate to be unable to handle, at least in the initial stages, a full course program. Most of the requirements listed in Table 13 could be a barrier to the economically disadvantaged student and consequently make such financial aid unavailable to the very group of people that need it most.

There are at least two if not three excellent sources of relatively untapped financial aid for the disadvantaged college student. Although these sources may be considered "end-of-road" since all other potential sources must be eliminated first, the B. C. Youth Foundation, the Vancouver Foundation, and possibly Vancouver Social Service offer at present the best hope for the poverty classified student to receive some aid. Apparently the assistance available from these organizations is not widely known, at least within the economic group that

TABLE 13

Characteristics of financial aid available to Vancouver City College Students.

Characteristics	B.C. Govt. Scholarship	Ass'n Admin. Ass't & Private Sec	Certified General Accountants	Van. City Fall	Employee's Ass'n	Cromie-Pacific Press	Union Memorial	Data Processing Management Ass'n	John Henderson	Native Canadian Indians	Industrial Catering	Vancouver Jaycettes	Pacific Command Can Legion	Hove St. Canada Manpower Staff Welfare	Grand Lodge Masons of B.C.
Prior Achievement	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		
Financial Need				X						X	X	X			X
Academic Potential						X		X							
Leadership Quality							X								
Full Time Student	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Restricted Group		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	
Application Deadline	X				X	X	X			X	X	X		X	
Available Once Year			X		X		X	X						X	
Limit of Aid	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Numbers Elligible		2	2	1	1	2	1	1		2	1		1		
Current Results	X									X					
Available in Spring	X		X	X						X					
Available in Summer	X									X					
Available in Fall	X				X	X	X			X	X			X	
Scholarship	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Bursary				X							X	X		X	
Loan															
Referral															

| | | |

this report is concerned with.

There is also the unsolved question of the advisability of "universal" aid programs. It may be fine to reward students who show particular scholastic apptitude, B. C. Government Scholarships would fit this class, but is it wise to do this if others, such as the poverty stricken are to be denied? A breakdown of the non-poverty classified students receiving financial aid is given in Appendix A. It can readily be seen that there are students receiving aid who could be identified as well above the poverty level.

Systems of loans such as the Canada Student Loan would be of far greater value to the economically disadvantaged student. There is, nevertheless, a serious criticism of the Canada Student Loan, at least as far as the poverty classed person is concerned. Essentially the Federal Government considers the primary responsibility to meet costs of post-secondary education to remain with the parent (guardian or immediate family) and (or) the student.[1] Therefore, a Parental Contribution Table has been developed to indicate the extent of family contribution. (Appendix C) The low point of contribution is 30 cents per week or $1.20 per month. This index then moves up to a level of contribution of $16.50 per week which would be thought of as a contribution for a "moderate level of income". For low income groups, and this could well include poverty level families, the contribution could run from the $1.20 per month already indicated to say a level of $20.00 per month. It is hard for someone not in the poverty category

1 Department of Education, Canada Student Loan Application. Victoria, B. C., p. 1.

to realize the importance of even $1.20 per month. I suggest that it is important enough to discourage the potential poverty student. When loss of potential income is added, is it any wonder that even loans from the Federal Government are not conducive to encouraging the economically disadvantaged to attend college.

Applications for financial aid tend to resemble in their complexity the federal income tax form and the assumptions about income and assets which seem to underlie most application forms for financial aid are totally irrelevant to the lives of the economically disadvantaged. The very terminology may be unfamiliar to the parent as well as potential student.

It would then appear that the majority of financial aid available is <u>not</u> available for those who need it most, that is those students who may well be classified as in <u>poverty</u>.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In making any definite conclusions as a result of the study it seems appropriate to express some caution. The group of subjects overall represents slightly less than 10 per cent of the total students enrolled. As has previously been mentioned, some difficulty was encountered in arriving at a precise means of identifying those students who would be classified as economically disadvantaged. It now seems evident that more than a questionnaire is needed. Quite possibly a "follow-up" interview would be of assistance. Also the range of groupings for indication of earnings of both student and family members was too wide for an accurate delineation of economic status. Although a picture is beginning to develop, the conclusions must be considered as somewhat tentative. It would be of interest to explore further ratification of these trends with future sample groups from Vancouver City College.

With these restrictions in mind, the following summary is given and conclusions can be drawn.

Summary

Nearly three quarters of the students sampled were under 25 years of age. Of the students 25 years and over, that is the group generally referred to as "mature students", a greater proportion are career students (37.3 per cent) than academic students (23.7 per cent). There was also a decided

tendency toward an older age grouping for women than men. "Mature" women accounted for 34.9 per cent of the female sample as compared with 22.4 per cent "mature" men from the male sample.

2. Nearly 60 per cent of the sample indicated that they lived with their parents. Just under 20 per cent lived with a spouse. As might be expected a large portion of career students either lived with a spouse or lived alone. At the same time just over half of the career students lived with their parents.

3. Just over half of the students reported their earnings for the year at under $2,000. On the other hand 11 per cent indicated that they earned over $4,000 during the past year.

4. When the earnings of a family unit were calculated, the above trend was reversed with nearly 60 per cent reporting an over $6,000 per year income. However, rather significantly from the point of view of this study was a 9.5 per cent report of earnings less than $2,000 per year.

5. Continuing the trend reported in other studies, students attending VCC from managerial or professional classified family units represented 35.9 per cent of the sample as compared to 21.2 per cent of the overall population in Vancouver. In other words, the upper occupational categories have a higher ratio of attendance at college than the lower or middle classes. In all other cases occupational classes were under represented when compared with the general populace with one exception. This exception was the labourer category where 6.3 per cent of the VCC sample were in this class as compared with only 3.9 per cent from the general public. It should be noted,

however, that 17.2 per cent of the sample did not give an indication as to occupation. This is a significant number which could completely alter the above description. Yet it might be safely assumed that the bulk of that 17.2 per cent would be from "lower" class occupations. Table 14 summarizes these conclusions.

6. Five per cent of the sample were classified as economically disadvantaged, that is, at a poverty level. When one considers that the poverty rate for Canada has been placed at from 25 to 35 per cent, it is safe to state that the proportion of economically disadvantaged attending college is significantly below the proportion that one would find in the general populace.

7. All told, 15.6 per cent of the sample received some financial aid, either in the form of scholarships, bursaries, or loans. Of the 49 students receiving this assistance only four were from the poverty group. It is interesting to speculate as to how the remaining 12 economically disadvantaged survive. It is entirely possible that the respondents' replies were not reliable, and in reality these students were receiving more earnings or indirect financial help than indicated. On the other hand it is entirely possible that these students were barely "surviving" at a poverty level. In either case it would seem mandatory that further exploration of this situation be conducted.

8. From a close study of the 49 students who did receive financial aid a question does arise as to the value of a "universal" scholarship. It would appear that students who

TABLE 14

315 member sample of Vancouver City College, February 1969, according to occupational class as compared with occupational class listed for Vancouver residents.*

Occupational Class	V.C.C.		Vancouver City	
	No.	%	No.	%
Managerial	58	18.4	15,314	10.0
Professional & Technical	55	17.5	17,223	11.2
Clerical	25	7.9	29,209	19.0
Sales	28	8.9	13,294	8.6
Service & Recreation	27	8.6	24,106	15.7
Transport & Communication	13	4.1	9,851	6.4
Primary	12	3.8	3,394	2.2
Craftsmen, Production	23	7.3	35,371	23.0
Labourer	20	6.3	6,089	3.9
Not listed	54	17.2	-	-
TOTAL	315	100.0	153,851	100.0

* Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Population and Housing Characteristics by Census Tracts, Vancouver. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1963.

do not really "need", from a financial point of view, are receiving financial aid. This aid could come in the form of, for example, B. C. Government Scholarships. It should be pointed out, however, that for the person at the poverty level, the maximum payment of three quarters of tuition costs would be of very little help.

9. Of those students in the sample, 5.7 per cent received benefits from the B. C. Scholarship plan, 4.1 per cent received Canada Student Loans, 2.8 per cent assistance from Canada Manpower, with lesser assistance from other organizations. Over four fifths of the student sample reported no financial assistance.

10. Four fifths of the students reported knowledge of available financial assistance. One must ponder why as many as 20 per cent did not know of such aid. This is especially so when during the previous college semester some 335 (8.2 per cent) students of the total enrollment were reported eligible for B. C. Government Scholarships alone, but only 126 applied for and received them.

11. As far as source of knowledge of availability of aid is concerned, for the academic student, "friends" would be the prime source, with the high-school counsellor and VCC publications accounting for the next most important source. In the case of career students, none reported friends as a source but place VCC publications and counsellors high on the list as sources of information. It would, therefore, seem obvious that the type of client will determine the best method of advertising aid to college students. In other words continued

emphasis must be placed on college publications and counsellors to reach the career candidates, while "word of mouth" from friends and information from high-school counsellors would seem the best method for academic students.

Conclusions

The main problem is three fold in nature:

1. identification of the economically disadvantaged;
2. encouragement of the poverty classes to attend college;
3. assistance with financial problems.

Identification:

1. New ways must be found to create the bridge that apparently exists between the college and earning a living for our young people; those that still are in school and those that have left school.
2. With only 5 per cent of the sample of college students considered as economically disadvantaged, more must be done in the way of identifying the remaining 20 to 30 per cent of poverty classified persons to ensure that an equitable proportion of all socio-economic groups are able to attend the "open-door" college.
3. A Canadian development of an independent "financial need" reporting service similar to the Financial Aid Services of the American College Testing Program should be considered.[1]

1 Financial Aid Services of the American College Testing Program, P.O. Box 1000, Iowa City, Iowa 52240.

Encouragement:

1. Admissions procedures must be made easy to not only admit the economically disadvantaged, but to also assist with financial aid the applicant who suddenly discovers the college after a formal deadline.

2. Appropriate means must be developed to communicate with the poor. Student-to-student help still appears to be the best means of extending college information. The poor, since his family in all probability includes school dropouts and his friends may well be disinterested in further education as a mobility instrument, is in a decided communication "black-out" area.

3. The community in general, especially the business world must be prepared to give every assistance in educational opportunity grants, work-study jobs to not only "safe" students of proven academic ability, but most important to the "high risk" student who is very poor.

Financial Aid:

1. The present "universal aid" program of scholarships, both government and private is ineffectual. The bulk of the financial aid is going to those persons who need it least, that is those persons not considered as economically disadvant-aged.

2. Existing sources of financial aid are generally speaking "unavailable" to the economically disadvantaged due to requirements of previous academic standing, discriminatory clauses, or insistence of attendance as a full-time student.

3. The Federal Government through its Adult Occupational

Training Act provides an excellent example of ideal financial assistance to students. This plan, however, places "occupational training" before education. The government, therefore, is helping to develop a two class system, where a student wishing to become educated must rely on a student loan (which of course must be repaid, whereas the benefactor from "occupational training" has no such repayment concern.)

4. The presence of financial aid from "referral" agencies such as the B. C. Youth Foundation, the Vancouver Foundation, and Social Service could be of considerable help to those at a poverty level. Availability of such aid must be widely publicized by all means possible so that the economically disadvantaged may have an opportunity of continuing an education.

Interpretations

If all steps possible were taken to encourage and assist the socio-economically disadvantaged category so poorly represented in college at the present time, one might well claim that the college facilities would be "inundated" - if this is so, then so-be-it! Existing "numbers crisis" is by no means any justification for not doing all possible to locate, encourage and assist the economically disadvantaged person to enjoy his right and privilege to take part in "tertiary" education. This can only be done through a complete reappraisal of existing financial aid programmes.

CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That "tertiary" education at a two-year college is a <u>right</u> of all who wish to avail themselves of the opportunity regardless of socio-economic status.
2. That the Federal Government extend the philosophy expressed in the Adult Occupational Training Act to include those who wish to have an education in addition to those who wish solely "occupational training".
3. That the Federal Government immediately eliminate discriminatory practices in all departments and that the educational and financial aid provided by such departments as the Department of Indian Affairs be extended to include <u>all</u> citizens of Canada.
4. That where loans are still considered advisable as under Canada Student Loans, that eligibility shall be established automatically upon admission to the college regardless of academic background or number of courses undertaken.
5. That private organizations be encouraged to recognize the need of the economically disadvantaged and that these organizations be persuaded to enlarge on present contributions.
6. That private organizations be encouraged to eliminate the restrictive features of qualification and to remove those clauses that discriminate against those who either by themselves or through their families are not connected with said organization.

7. That "last resort" sources of financial aid such as Social Services and Vancouver Foundation be encouraged to offer financial aid to those who need it without the degrading process of exhausting all other possibilities first.

8. That a central agency be established where all offers and requests for aid would be channelled and the final decision as to those that need the aid would be made outside of the 'granting' body and the educational institution concerned.

9. That the "universal" aspect of financial aid be discontinued as wasteful and ineffectual, especially in cases similar to B. C. Government Scholarships and that the "universal" aspect be replaced by one based solely on the financial need of the applicant.

10. That the reading level required for financial aid forms be revised in an attempt to simplify them and make it possible for the disadvantaged to easily fill out these forms.

11. That unconventional means be used to contact and inform the economically disadvantaged of the opportunities in the college system.

12. That advertisements regarding community college programmes make it perfectly clear as to the availability of all potential sources of financial aid and encourage students to apply for this aid.

13. That notices regarding community college opportunities be conspicuously placed in all public housing developments,

community centers, and any other establishment where the economically disadvantaged may congregate.

14. That all persons who directly or indirectly deal with members of the economically disadvantaged (such as members of the police Youth Preventive Squad, social workers, probation officers, 'big brother' organizations) be made fully aware of possible educational opportunities and financial aid presently available.

15. That these persons make no attempt to judge whether the individual is a "high risk" student or a "safe" student of proven academic ability, but rather leave this to members of the college community who have the professional competence to make such judgements.

16. That college faculty realize the true meaning of an "open door" policy and welcome and give all assistance needed even to those students who may, at least on the surface, appear to be not only economically poor but academically poor.

17. That college faculty and administration recognize that it may be necessary to carry college opportunities to the economically disadvantaged by setting up college classes in the very neighbourhoods where the disadvantaged reside.

18. That all concerned with the two-year college concept recognize and accept the view that at present the economically disadvantaged person does not have the same opportunities for education as others and that this condition must be modified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Becker, Howard S., Social Problems. New York, N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967.

2. Bellan, R. C., Principles of Economics and the Canadian Economy. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada, 1967.

3. Berton, Pierre, The Smug Minority. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1968.

4. Blishen, F, Jones, F, Naegele, K, and Porter, J., Canadian Society Sociological Perspectives. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1968.

5. Broom and Selznick, Sociology. New York, N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1963.

6. Canadian Association for Adult Education, The Sixties: Poverty in our Society. Toronto, Ontario, Nov. 1965.

7. Dixon, W. G., Meeting Poverty. Ottawa: Special Planning Secretariat, Privy Council Office.

8. Halsey, A. H., Floud, J., and Anderson, C. A., Education, Economy and Society. New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, 1967.

9. Havinghurst, R. J., Neugarten, B. L., Society and Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.

10. Jenness, R. A., The Dimensions of Poverty in Canada. Privy Council Office, Ottawa.

11. Kolko, Gabriel, Wealth and Power in America. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1965.

12. Landis, Judson R., Current Perspectives on Social Problems. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1968.

13. Menzies, M. W., Poverty in Canada. Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Pool Elevators, 1965.

14. Oliver, Michael, Social Purpose for Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

15. Porter, John, The Vertical Mosaic. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965.

16. Porter, John, Canadian Social Structure, A Statistical Profile. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, Ltd., 1967.

17. Raynauld, Andre, The Canadian Economic System. Toronto: MacMillan Company of Canada, Ltd., 1967.

18. Rossides, Daniel W., Society as a Functional Process: An Introduction to Sociology. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Company of Canada, Ltd., 1968.

19. Schlesinger, Benjamin, Poverty in Canada. Toronto: School of Social Work, University of Toronto.

20. Sexton, Education and Income. New York: Viking Press, 1961.

21. Shostak, Arthur B. and Gomberg, William, New Perspectives on Poverty. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.

22. Special Planning Secretariat, Profile of Poverty in Canada, Ottawa: Privy Council Office.

23. Watkins, M. H., and Forster, D. F., Economics: Canada. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Co. of Canada, 1965.

24. Young, K, and Mack, R., Sociology and Social Life. New York: Northwestern University American Book Company, 1959.

APPENDIX A

Non-poverty members of the sample according to reported earnings and reported financial aid received.

	Financial Aid		Family Unit			Total Income (Earning + Aid)		Income status listed
	Organization	Am't	No.	Minimum Earning	Average per member		Average per member	
	CAREER STUDENTS	$		$	$	$	$	
1	Manpower	880	2	6000	3000	6880	3440	middle
2	"	600	2	4000	2000	4600	2300	lower
3	"	1200	1	2000	2000	3200	3200	lower
4	"	500	2	5000	2500	5500	2750	middle
5	"	600	3	5000	1666	5600	1866	middle
6	"	1295	1	2000	2000	3295	3295	middle
7	Canada	1000	4	6000	1500	7000	1750	-
8	Student	300	1	3000	3000	3300	3300	low
9	Loan	900	1	3000	3000	3900	3900	middle
10	"	600	3	6000	2000	6600	2200	low
11	"	200	5	6000	1200	6200	1240	low
12	"	350	5	6000	1200	6350	1270	low
13	B.C. Govt.	35	3	6000	2000	6035	2012	middle
14	Scholarship	50	3	-	-	-	-	lower
15	"	33	3	6000	2000	6033	2011	upper
16	"	33	3	6000	2000	6033	2011	lower
17	"	75	3	4000	1333	4075	1357	middle
18	"	50	3	6000	2000	6050	2017	lower
19	"	33	2	4000	2000	4033	2016	lower
20	"	75	2	6000	3000	6075	3038	middle
21	Others	500	2	5000	2500	5500	2750	middle
22	"	400	2	6000	3000	6400	3200	middle
23	"	1770	3	4000	1333	5770	1923	middle
24	"	50	3	6000	2000	6050	2017	middle
25	"	83	3	6000	2000	6083	2027	middle
26	"	200	5	6000	1200	6200	1240	middle
27	"	100	3	6000	2000	6100	2033	lower
28	"	600	1	6000	6000	6600	6600	lower
	ACADEMIC							
29	Canada	1000	1	2000	2000	3000	3000	lower
30	Student	550	3	4000	1333	4550	1517	lower
31	Loan	1000	1	6000	6000	7000	7000	middle
32	"	750	3	4000	1333	4750	1583	lower
33	"	300	3	6000	2000	6300	2100	middle
34	"	400	2	4000	2000	4400	2200	lower
35	"	400	1	2000	2000	2400	2400	lower
36	B.C. Govt.	75	1	4000	4000	4075	4075	middle
37	Scholarship	75	2	6000	3000	6075	3037	lower
38	"	54	2	10000	5000	10054	5027	middle
39	"	75	3	6000	2000	6075	2025	middle
40	"	50	2	4000	2000	4050	2025	middle
41	"	75	1	4000	4000	4075	4075	lower
42	Others	50	3	3000	1000	3050	1017	middle
43	"	200	3	6000	2000	6200	2073	middle
44	"	100	1	1000	1000	1100	1100	lower
45	"	120	3	4000	1333	4120	1373	middle

APPENDIX B

Members of the sample classified as poverty according to maximum earnings reported and financial aid reported.

Student	Sex	Age	Family Unit			Financial Aid	
CAREER			No.	Max. Earnings Per Yr. $	Average per member $	Organization	Amount $
1	F	35-44	5	3000	600	Manpower	1344
2	M	25-34	1	1000	1000	Manpower	1305
3	M	35-44	4	2000	500	Soc. Assist.	1000-2000
4	F	35-44	3	3000	1000	Nil	Nil
ACADEMIC							
5	M	20-24	5	4000	800	Nil	Nil
6	M	35-44	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
7	M	25-34	1	1000	1000	Private	100 (loan)
8	F	25-34	2	2000	1000	Nil	Nil
9	M	20-24	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
10	M	35-44	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
11	M	17-19	3	3000	1000	Nil	Nil
12	M	20-24	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
13	M	20-24	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
14	F	17-19	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
15	M	20-24	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil
16	M	25-34	1	1000	1000	Nil	Nil

PARENTAL CONTRIBUTION TABLE

Index No.	Contribution Basic per Week $	Contribution Add'l per Year $
1 - 100	0.30	0
101 - 200	0.90	0
201 - 300	1.50	0
301 - 400	2.10	0
401 - 500	2.70	0
501 - 600	3.30	0
601 - 700	3.90	0
701 - 800	4.50	0
801 - 900	5.10	0
901 - 1000	5.70	0
1001 - 1100	6.30	0
1101 - 1200	6.90	0
1201 - 1300	7.50	0
1301 - 1400	8.10	0
1401 - 1500	8.70	0
1501 - 1600	9.30	0
1601 - 1700	9.90	0
1701 - 1800	10.50	0
1801 - 1900	11.10	0
1901 - 2000	11.70	0
2001 - 2100	12.30	0
2101 - 2200	12.90	0
2201 - 2300	13.50	0
2301 - 2400	14.10	0
2401 - 2500	14.70	0
2501 - 2600	15.30	0
2601 - 2700	15.90	0
2701 - 2800	16.50	0
2801 - 2900	17.00	11
2901 - 3000	17.00	33
3001 - 3100	17.00	55
3101 - 3200	17.00	77
3201 - 3300	17.00	99
3301 - 3400	17.00	121
3401 - 3500	17.00	143
3501 - 3600	17.00	165
3601 - 3700	17.00	187
3701 - 3800	17.00	209
3801 - 3900	17.00	232
3901 - 4000	17.00	256
4001 - 4100	17.00	280
4101 - 4200	17.00	304
4201 - 4300	17.00	328
4301 - 4400	17.00	352
4401 - 4500	17.00	376
4501 - 4600	17.00	400
4601 - 4700	17.00	424
4701 - 4800	17.00	438
4801 - 4900	17.00	473
4901 - 5000	17.00	498
5001 - 5100	17.00	523
5101 - 5200	17.00	548
5201 - 5300	17.00	573
5301 - 5400	17.00	598
5401 - 5500	17.00	623
5501 - 5600	17.00	648
5601 - 5700	17.00	673
5701 - 5800	17.00	698
5801 - 5900	17.00	725
5901 - 6000	17.00	754
6001 - 6100	17.00	783
6101 - 6200	17.00	812
6201 - 6300	17.00	841
6301 - 6400	17.00	870
6401 - 6500	17.00	899
6501 - 6600	17.00	928
6601 - 6700	17.00	957
6701 - 6800	17.00	986
6801 - 6900	17.00	1016
6901 - 7000	17.00	1048
7001 - 7100	17.00	1080
7101 - 7200	17.00	1112
7201 - 7300	17.00	1144
7301 - 7400	17.00	1176
7401 - 7500	17.00	1208
7501 - 7600	17.00	1240
7601 - 7700	17.00	1272
7701 - 7800	17.00	1304
7801 - 7900	17.00	1337
7901 - 8000	17.00	1371